PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS INSPECTION SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Control Information

Inspection Start Date*:	05/04/2016				
Inspection End Date*:	05/04/2016				
OpID:	4500				
Parent Operator Name:	City of Enumclaw				
Unit ID (s):	NA				
State/Other ID:	NA				
Activity Record ID No.	NA				
Address of Company Official*:	Company	Liz Reynolds			
The Honorable Liz Reynolds	Official*:				
City of Enumclaw	Title*:	Mayor			
1339 Griffin Avenue	Phone Number*:	360-825-3591			
Enumclaw, WA 98022	Fax Number:	360-825-1429			
	Email Address*:	lreynolds@ci.enumclaw.wa.us			
Web Site:					
Total Mileage (from page 3)*:	95.87 mi.				
Total Mileage in HCA:	0				
Number of Services (For	4,246				
Distribution):					
Alternate MAOP (80%	NA				
Rule):					
No. of Special Permits:	NA				

Initial Date of Public Awareness Program*:	June 2006
Title of Current PAP*:	The City of Enumclaw Public Awareness
	Program
Current PAP Version*:	PA is updated and reviewed annually as part
	of the O&M. The PA has had [3] revisions.
Current PAP Date*:	

Post Inspection Information			
Date Submitted for Approval:			
Director Approval:			
Approval Date:			

^{*} Required field

Persons Interviewed*	Title/Organization*	Phone	Email Address
		Number	
Ed Hawthorne	Gas Manager	360 615 5787	ehawthorne@ci.enumclaw.wa.us
Vickie Forler	Administrative Assistant	360 615 5724	vforler@ci.enumclaw.wa.us

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

External Support Entity	Part of Plan and/or	Phone Number	Email Address
Name*	Evaluation*		

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

Inspector	PHMSA/State*	Region/State*	Email Address	Lead*
Representative(s)*				
Anthony Dorrough			adorroug@utc.wa.gov	\boxtimes Y \square
				N
				☐ Y ☐
				N
				☐ Y ☐
				N
				☐ Y ☐
				N
				☐ Y ☐
				N

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

^{*} Required field

Mileage Covered by Public Awareness Program (by Company and State)

Based on the most recently submitted annual report, list each company and subsidiary separately, broken down by state (using 2-letter designation). Also list any new lines in operation that are not included on the most recent annual report. If a company has intrastate and/or interstate mileage in several states, use one row per state. If there are both gas and liquid lines, use the appropriate table for intrastate and/or interstate.

Jurisdictional to Part 192 (Gas) Mileage (Interstate)

Company Name (Gas Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Int er state Gathering Mileage*	Int er state Transmission Mileage	Int er state Distribution Mileage^*	Remarks (new or in HCA)
NA							

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Jurisdictional to Part 192 (Gas) Mileage (Intrastate)

Company Name (Gas Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Int ra state Gathering Mileage*	Int ra state Transmission Mileage*	Int ra state Distribution Mileage^*	Remarks (new or in HCA)
City of Enumclaw			WA	Na	Na	95.87	0

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Jurisdictional to Part 195 (Hazardous Liquid) Mileage (Interstate)

Company Name (Liquid Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Int er state Transmission Mileage*	Remarks (new or in HCA~)
NA					

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Jurisdictional to Part 195 (Hazardous Liquid) Mileage (Intrastate)

				arous Electronic (Illians	
Company Name (Liquid Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Int ra state Transmission Mileage*	Remarks (new or in HCA~)
NA					

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Total Mileage: 95.87

- 1. Supply company name and Operator ID, if not the master operator from the first page (i.e., for subsidiary companies).
- 2. Use OPS-assigned Operator ID. Where not applicable, leave blank or enter N/A
- 3. Use only 2-letter State codes, e.g., TX for Texas.
- 4. Enter number of applicable miles in applicable columns. (Only positive values. No need to enter 0 or N/A.)
- ^ Please do not include Service Line footage. This should only be MAINS.
- * Required Field
- Use Total HCA as reported on annual reports.

PHMSA Form 21 Public Awareness Program Effectiveness Inspection, July 21, 2011, Rev 0

Please provide a comment or explanation for each inspection question.

1. Administration and Development of Public Awareness Program

1.01 Written Public Education Program

Does the operator have a written continuing public education program or public awareness program (PAP) in accordance with the general program recommendations in the American Petroleum Institute's (API) Recommended Practice (RP) 1162 (incorporated by reference), by the required date, except for master meter or petroleum gas system operators?

(Reference: § 192.616 (h); § 195.440 (h))

- Verify the operator has a written public awareness program (PAP).
- Review any Clearinghouse deficiencies and verify the operator addressed previous Clearinghouse deficiencies, if any, addressed in the operator's PAP.

Enumclaw wrote its plan in 2006, reformatted it to go into the O&M in 2007 and made updates in 2009, in addition every annual evaluation and implementation is described in detail in that years book titled Summary of Communication. Enumclaw reviewed the last APGA Cumulative Report against the PAP and found no deficiencies (see 7-A Section 8)

• Identify the location where the operator's PAP is administered and which company personnel is designated to administer and manage the written program.

PAP is located at Public Works Department, 1309 Myrtle Ave, Enumclaw, WA and is administered by Vicki Forler.

- Verify the date the public awareness program was initially developed and published.
- Verify the PAP includes a written statement of management support.

See Resolution 1411 approved by the Enumclaw City Council on April 7, 2011.

• Determine how management participates in the PAP.

Management pledges PAP will continue to be funded through the operating budget in an amount necessary to achieve the program's purpose. Hawthorne goes over implementation with the mayor yearly and determines costs needed for the program. Includes a listing of what is to be accomplished.

 Verify that an individual is named and identified to administer the program with roles and responsibilities.

Jeff Lincoln, Public Works Director, oversees the program with input from Hawthorne

• Verify resources provided to implement public awareness are in the PAP. Determine how many employees involved with the PAP and what their roles are.

Enumclaw provides brochures, print advertisements, and runs awareness bulletins in both movie theaters in town, and the local public television station.

 Determine if the operator uses external support resources for any implementation or evaluation efforts.

No third party external support resources involved currently. Enumclaw previously used the APGA Gold Program but now just uses the APGA Cumulative Report.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above, * Required	field

1.02)?Management Support

Does the operator's program include a statement of manage support (i.e. is there evidence of a commitment of participation, resources, and allocation of funding

1.03 Unique Attributes and Characteristics

Does the operator's program clearly define the specific pipeline assets or systems covered in the program and assess the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities?

(Reference: § 192.616 (b); § 195.440 (b); API RP 1162 Section 2.7 and Section 4)

- Verify the PAP includes all of the operator's system types/assets covered by PAP (gas, liquid, HVL, storage fields, gathering lines etc).
- Identify where in the PAP the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities are included (i.e. gas, liquids, compressor station, valves, breakout tanks, odorizer).

Enumclaw uses a distribution system with all appropriate attributes. (See Procedure 7A, Section 5(b))

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:		
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*			
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*			
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*			
Check exactly one box above. * Required field			

1.04 Stakeholder Audience Identification

Does the operator's program establish methods to identify the individual stakeholders in the four affected stakeholder audience groups: (1) affected public, (2) emergency officials, (3) local public officials, and (4) excavators, as well as affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents?

(Reference: § 192.616 (d), (e), (f); § 195.440 (d), (e), (f); API RP 1162 Section 2.2 and Section 3)

• 1. Identify how the operator determines stakeholder notification areas and distance on either side of the pipeline.

Enumclaw uses billing system and GIS to determine list. (See O&M Procedure 7B Section 2.1.)

• 2. Determine the process and/or data source used to identify each stakeholder audience.

Enumclaw uses the gas system boundary lines. Outside of the city this includes whole parcels, in some cases that is over 1000 feet, and in the city it includes all people along the pipeline. PSE is on the other side of the system boundary line in all cases. In all other areas the city uses all people on pipeline (Enumclaw verifies their numbers by comparing the gas and sewer records)

•	3. Select a location along the operator's system and verify the operator has a documented list of
	stakeholders consistent with the requirements and references noted above.

\boxtimes	Affected public
\boxtimes	Emergency officials
	Public officials
\boxtimes	Excavators

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: Affected Public: Sent to non-gas customers. Emergency Responders: All surrounding emergency agencies. Hawthorne hand delivers	
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*		
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	Enumclaw Emergency Plan to all emergency	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	response agencies and mails it to schools and	

	public officials.
	Public Officials: Frank Jerry is contact for
	Muckleshoot Tribe. And visits officials for [10]
	other surrounding cities.
	Excavators: Uses the MRSC (Municipal Research
	and Services Center), this site has list of all
	contractors who can work in Enumclaw, also
	excavators who requested locates in the city, and all
	contractors who have worked in the city and that
	are in the phone book.
Check exactly one box above. * Required	field

1.05 Message Frequency and Message Delivery

Does the operator's program define the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies to comprehensively reach all affected stakeholder audiences in all areas in which the operator transports gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide?

(See O&M Procedure 7B, Appendix 7-B-1)

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Sections 3-5)

• Identify where in the operator's PAP the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies are included for the following stakeholders:

Affected Public (non-customers): Annually. Reviewed US Post Office proof of postage. Twice a year placed newspapers advertising and spots at local TV station.

Customers: twice annually. Street fair: supplemental. Phone and web surveys.

Emergency Responders: Annually. With mailings. Supplemental: Gas

Manager meets with each organization in their office.

Public Officials: 3 years, but go beyond by doing it annually.

Excavators: Annually. Holds annual breakfast meeting.

 ✓ Emergency officials ✓ Public officials ✓ Excavators 	
S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Frequency for:
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	

Check exactly one box above. * Required field

N/C – Not Checked (explain)*

1.06 Written Evaluation Plan

Affected public

Does the operator's program include a written evaluation process that specifies how the operator will periodically evaluate program implementation and effectiveness? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c), (i); § 195.440 (c), (i))

- Verify the operator has a written evaluation plan that specifies how the operator will conduct and evaluate self-assessments (annual audits) and effectiveness evaluations.
- Verify the operator's evaluation process specifies the correct frequency for annual audits (1 year) and effectiveness evaluations (no more than 4 years apart).

• Identify how the operator determined a statistical sample size and margin-of-error for stakeholder audiences' surveys and feedback.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	For Evaluation Process (See O&M Procedure 7-E)(No change since last inspection)
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	E)(No change since tast inspection)
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	Statistical Sample size and margin of error: From API standard E.3 Supplemental Information to Operators Conducting Surveys to Evaluate Effectiveness. A survey of 100 people in this 4000 population service area has a margin of error of +or – 10%. (No change since last inspection)
	Staff recommended Enumclaw provide more detail
Charles and the same harmal area * Daniel	in PAP regarding margin of error in the future.
Check exactly one box above. * Required	Tiela

2. Program Implementation

2.01 English and other Languages

Did the operator develop and deliver materials and messages in English and in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of non-English speaking populations in the operator's areas?

(Reference: § 192.616 (g); § 195.440 (g); API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

- Determine if the operator delivers material in languages other than English and if so, what languages.
- Identify the process the operator used to determine the need for additional languages for each stakeholder audience.
- Identify the source of information the operator used to determine the need for additional languages and the date the information was collected.

S − Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:		
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	(See O&M Procedure 7A, Section 7) Only in English. Rely on web-based Census info for		
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	data. According to data they still have 94% English,		
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	3.4% Spanish or Latino.		
Check exactly one box above. * Required field			

2.02 Message Type and Content

Did the messages the operator delivered specifically include provisions to educate the public, emergency officials, local public officials, and excavators on the:

- Use of a one-call notification system prior to excavation and other damage prevention activities;
- Possible hazards associated with unintended releases from a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline facility;
- Physical indications of a possible release;
- Steps to be taken for public safety in the event of a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline release; and
- Procedures to report such an event (to the operator)?

(Reference: § 192.616 (d); (f); § 195.440 (d), (f))

- Verify all required information was delivered to each of the primary stakeholder audiences.
- Verify the phone number listed on message content is functional and clearly identifies the operator to the caller.
 Affected public

Emergency officials		
☐ Public officials		
Excavators		
	T ~	_
S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:	

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:		
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	(See O&M Procedure 7, Section 7b) Number still works for city gas shop during day and		
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	to police dispatch after hours.		
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*			
Check exactly one box above. * Required field			

2.03 Messages on Pipeline Facility Locations

Did the operator develop and deliver messages to advise affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents of pipeline facility location?

(Reference: § 192.616 (e), (f); § 195.440 (e), (f))

• Verify that the operator developed and delivered messages advising municipalities, school districts, businesses, residents of pipeline facility locations.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:		
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	All addresses, inside the gas system boundary are included.		
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	memeu.		
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	Still includes schools, businesses and residents.		
Check exactly one box above. * Required field			

2.04 Baseline Message Delivery Frequency

Did the operator's delivery for materials and messages meet or exceed the baseline frequencies specified in API RP 1162, Table 2-1 through Table 2.3? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c))

•	Identify message delivery	(using th	e operator'	's last fi	ive years o	f records)	for the f	ollowing
	stakeholder audiences:							

Affected	public
11110000	paome

PHMSA Form 21 Public Awareness Program Effectiveness Inspection, July 21, 2011, Rev 0

Emergency officialsPublic officialsExcavators	
S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	These are done annually, over and beyond the 3 years mentioned in their O&M.
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	years mentioned in their OWM.
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Require	d field
supplemental program enhancements as desc (Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); A	peline systems, relevant factors to determine the need for cribed in API RP 1162 for each stakeholder audience? PI RP 1162 Section 6.2) I and/or included other relevant factors for supplemental
S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	See notebook for each year.
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	

2.06 Maintaining Liaison with Emergency Response Officials

Check exactly one box above. * Required field

Did the operator establish and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, police, and other public officials to: learn the responsibility and resources of each government organization that may respond, acquaint the officials with the operator's ability in responding to a pipeline emergency, identify the types of pipeline emergencies of which the operator notifies the officials, and plan how the operator and other officials can engage in mutual assistance to minimize hazards to life or property?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 4.4)

- Examine the documentation to determine how the operator maintains a relationship with appropriate emergency officials.
- Verify the operator has made its emergency response plan available, as appropriate and necessary, to emergency response officials.
- Identify the operator's expectations for emergency responders and identify whether the expectations are the same for all locations or does it vary depending on locations.
- Identify how the operator determined the affected emergency response organizations have adequate and proper resources to respond.
- Identify how the operator ensures that information was communicated to emergency responders that did not attend training/information sessions by the operator.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Emergency Officials: Meets with them annually, from list in an emergency
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	response manual.
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	All emergency first responders are part of the City of Enumclaw. (No change since last inspection)
	Expectations outlined in Manual 3, Procedure 3-J. This is discussed with emergency officials at meeting. (No change since last inspection)
	Information is communicated one on one or through group meetings. (No change since last inspection)
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

3. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Annual Audits)

3.01 Measuring Program Implementation

Has the operator performed an audit or review of its program implementation annually since it was developed? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c), (i); § 195.440 (c), (i); API RP 1162 Section 8.3)

• Verify the operator performed an annual audit or review of the PAP for each implementation year.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Done annually and documented in the Summary of Communication for each year. (No change since
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	last inspection)
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	-
	Annual audit is found in Annual Review of PAP
	implementation memo.
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

3.02 Acceptable Methods for Program Implementation Audits

Did the operator use one or more of the three acceptable methods (i.e., internal assessment, 3rd-party contractor review, or regulatory inspections) to complete the annual audit or review of its program implementation? If not, did the operator provide valid justification for not using one of these methods?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.3)

• Determine how the operator conducts annual audits/reviews of its PAP.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Viewed Internal Assessment (See Manual 7E)
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

3.03 Program Changes and Improvements

Did the operator make changes to improve the program and/or the implementation process based on the results and findings of the annual audit? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.3)

- Determine if the operator assessed the results of its annual PAP audit/review then developed and implemented changes in its program, as a result.
- If not, determine if the operator documented the results of its assessment and provided justification as to why no changes were needed.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Last inspection staff—Identified that they needed to focus on the public. They have improved since then
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	and have done a much better job overall focusing
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	on the public in staff's opinion.
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

4. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Effectiveness)

4.01 Evaluating Program Effectiveness

Did the operator perform an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation) to assess its program effectiveness in all areas along all systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4)

- Verify the operator conducted an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation).
- Document when the effectiveness evaluation was completed.
- Determine what method was used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (in-house, by 3rd party contractor, participation in and use the results of an industry group or trade association).
- Identify how the operator determined the sample sizes for audiences in performing its effectiveness evaluation.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Verified Annual Review Public Awareness Program Effectiveness document.
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	Effectiveness document.
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

4.02 Measure Program Outreach

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator track actual program outreach for each stakeholder audience within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1)

- Examine the process the operator used to track the number of individuals or entities reached within each intended stakeholder audience group.
- Determine the outreach method the operator used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (e.g., questionnaires, telephone surveys, etc).

•	the four intended stakeholder audiences.	the statistical sample size and margin-of-error for each of C for different employee task groups and required
	 ✓ Affected public ✓ Emergency officials ✓ Public officials ✓ Excavators 	
Ī		Comments
	S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: They contacted all stakeholders.
	U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	They condicted all statementers.
	N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	Emergency Responders: [19] mailed brochures,
	N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	letters and hand delivered emergency manuals.
		Public Officials: [14] mailed brochures, letters and hand delivered or mailed emergency manuals.
		Excavators: [98]
		Affected Public: [796] Non gas and non-water customers are [789] along pipeline. Water customers total approximately [3,200], Gas customers Total [4,300].
		Sample size is 100 based on API 1162 which makes a 10% margin of error. They cover everybody in the city limits.
	Check exactly one box above. * Require	d field
Dio targ		the individual or entities actually reached within the tems covered by its program? If not, did the operator lural manual?
•	the four intended stakeholder audiences.	e percentage of individuals or entities actually reached

Comments:

Affected public
Emergency officials
Public officials

S – Satisfactory (explain)*

Excavators

U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Excavators: 100% contacted with 10% margin of
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	error. Emergency and Public Officials: 100% contacted
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	Affected Public: 100 % customers reached in bill stuffer and non-customers with a 5% margin of
	error.
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

4.04 Measure Understandability of Message Content

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audiences that understood and retained the key information in the messages received, within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2)

- Examine the operator's evaluation results and data to assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that understood and retained the key information in each PAP message.

Verify the operator assessed the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that (1) understood and (2) retained the key information in each PAP message.	
Determine if the operator pre-tests mat	terials.
☐ Affected public ☐ Emergency officials ☐ Public officials ☐ Excavators	
S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Doesn't use survey Monkey anymore, instead uses direct outreach. Gets verbal feedback from one on

S - Saustactory (explain)*	Comments.	
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Doesn't use survey Monkey anymore, instead uses direct outreach. Gets verbal feedback from one on	
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	one with emergency and public officials. (No change	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	since last inspection)	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field		

4.05 Measure Desired Stakeholder Behavior

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to determine whether appropriate preventive behaviors have been understood and are taking place when needed, and whether appropriate response and mitigative behaviors would occur and/or have occurred? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.3)

- Examine the operator's evaluation results and data to determine if the stakeholders have demonstrated the intended learned behaviors.
- Verify the operator determined whether appropriate prevention behaviors have been understood by the stakeholder audiences and if those behaviors are taking place or will take place when needed.

Affected public
☐ Emergency officials
☐ Public officials

☐ Excavators	
S – Satisfactory (explain)* U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	Comments: The survey compares the current year's number of answers to previous year's answers. (No change
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	since last inspection)
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	Excavators: 2012 [8]; 2013 [1]; 2014 [2]; 2015 [5]. Public and Emergency officials: 100% because of one on one contact. Affected Public: Number of locates for 2012 [601]; 2013 [484]; 2014 [638]; 2015 [664].
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

4.06 Measure Bottom-Line Results

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to measure bottom-line results of its program by tracking third-party incidents and consequences including: (1) near misses, (2) excavation damages resulting in pipeline failures, (3) excavation damages that do not result in pipeline failures? Did the operator consider other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.4)

- Examine the operator's process for measuring bottom-line results of its program.
- Verify the operator measured bottom-line results by tracking third-party incidents and consequences.
- Determine if the operator considered and attempted to measure other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines. If not, determine if the operator has provided justification in its program or procedural manual for not doing so.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:	
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	81% agreed or strongly agreed Enumclaw is doing a good job of informing public of gas safety.	
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	a good job of agorning public of gus sujery.	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	Enumclaw continues to go beyond requirements	
	having developed five separate, detailed questions	
	that offer better results.	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field		

4.07 Program Changes

Did the operator identify and document needed changes and/or modifications to its public awareness program(s) based on the results and findings of its program effectiveness evaluation? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 2.7 Step 12 and 8.5)

- Examine the operator's program effectiveness evaluation findings.
- Identify if the operator has a plan or procedure that outlines what changes were made.
- Verify the operator identified and/or implemented improvements based on assessments and findings.

S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: Added council resolution to program. Improvements	
U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*		
N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	and supplements were documented.	
N/C – Not Checked (explain)*		
Check exactly one box above. * Required field		
5. Inspection Summary & Findings		
5.01 Summary		
The 2016 Public Awareness Inspection for The City of Enumclaw Public Awareness Program was conducted at a maintenance facility where records are retained. A brief exit interview was held shortly afterward to recap any issues. It is Staff's opinion that Enumclaw's PAP is well thought out, administered and documented. The inspection indicated no probable violations or AOC's.		
5.02 Findings		
There were no findings by Staff at this time.		